

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on September 12, 2006. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and interview, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-37 remain in this application.

Claims 1-24 and 26-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lincke (U.S. 6,253,326) in view of Inoue (U.S. 6,240,514) and in further view of "Wireless Authentication Protocol Wireless Transport Layer Specification" ("WAP WTLS"). Claim 25 was rejected as above as being unpatentable over Lincke in view of Inoue. For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites the step of "converting between WTLS and said one or both of the SSL or the TLS security protocol in a secured domain of said server administrated by an administrator". Claim 25 recites similar limitations.

At the personal interview, it was pointed out to the Examiner that the conversion of claims 1 and 25 was being done in a domain of said server, not in a gateway. The Examiner agreed that this was not how he was interpreting the claims, and thus he would reconsider those claims based on this discussion.

Furthermore, claim 1, as amended, recites that "a plurality of WTLS encrypted packets sent by said terminal are routed by said gateway to said secured domain with said gateway not decrypting any portion of at least some number of the encrypted packets transported during a session". The Examiner cites Inoue for teaching not decrypting all packets. However, it was pointed out to the Examiner that Inoue teaches that a portion of every packet is decrypted in order to extract the packet processing key, and then the packet must be re-encrypted (see, e.g., col. 3,

lines 30-32). Thus, the reference teaches that there are *no* packets that are not at least partially decrypted. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejections in light of clarifying language put into the claims. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the references for this reason as well.

The remaining independent claims, as amended, all recited language that cannot read on the reference for reasons similar to those discussed in the above paragraph. Accordingly, all remaining claims are patentable over the references for this reason.

Finally, no reference suggests the use of WTLS encrypted packets in a manner similar to the manner recited in the pertinent claims. In addition, applicant could find no discussion anywhere in the references for converting from one security protocol to another security protocol, each with an encryption.

Furthermore, Lincke does not disclose a WTLS-based gateway. Instead, the reference provides that the communication between the wireless user and the gateway is based on a proprietary CTP protocol encrypted according to a specific encryption scheme. Furthermore, Lincke does not disclose a WAP-enabled terminal, but rather a device and system of navigation of html-pages based on a special wireless protocol. Thus, the claims are patentable over the references for these reasons as well.

Finally, the Examiner has not provided the proper motivation for combining the references, and thus the rejections for obviousness should be withdrawn for this reason as well.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 09/592,916
Amdt. Dated September 20, 2006
Reply to Amdt. of July 14, 2006

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33544US1.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By 
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9th Street, Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

September 20, 2006